



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

BOOK REVIEWS

Die Religionsphilosophie Kaiser Julians in seinen Reden auf König Helios und die Göttermutter. Mit einer Uebersetzung der beiden Reden. Von GEORG MAU. Leipzig: Teubner, 1908. Pp. 169. M. 6.

Julian is the first imperial Roman after Julius Caesar whom one may call a man of letters. For Marcus Aurelius communing with himself is no more a literary man than were those emperors who, like Tiberius exploring the pedigree of Hecuba, took to Greek literature as a recreation from the daily routine of crime. Julian lived in a century when, creative genius being out of the question, to be literary was to be a sophist. But that aspect of him, his conformity to all the rules of the sophistic game, is to most people less interesting than his vain effort to give back polytheism to a reluctant world. The superficial phil-Hellene loves to sentimentalize over this failure of Julian's, as though here one saw the last attempt of the banished gods to restore beauty to the earth. But those who know their fourth Christian century are aware that, in spite of his *schwärmerei* for Athens, Julian was no Hellene, and that he was about as well qualified to revive the ethics and aesthetics of the Periclean Greeks as to achieve an Attic lucidity of thought or the charm of the Attic literary manner. He was a convinced and consistent Puritan. Plato could write of the Beautiful with such passion that the Good, however explicitly set up as the highest educational ideal, pales a little by contrast. But Julian, apart from his strong language when he scolds the vicious, always writes like a bishop. Many a bishop might envy him that unswerving strength of conviction for whose sake history ought to have forgiven all his mistakes. What has not been forgiven Julian is his restlessness, the instability of his outward expression, the number of parts into which he flung himself with the intensity of a fanatic, playing in turn military leader, railing cynic, oriental mystic, rhetorician, and Neo-Platonist.

Judging from what he saw about him he decided that Christ had failed to impose morality on the world. It was all to do again, this time by a philosopher, by one who could turn to account all that had been added to the dominant philosophy of his times, all the oriental grafts on Neo-Platonism. And, since Christian doctrine had proved so attractive to the masses, he would not hesitate to adapt certain of its essential features to the combination of religion and philosophy that was to take its place. He had ridiculed Christianity as an oriental cult that could have

no part in Hellenism, yet he turned for allies, not to Athens or the Roman aristocracy, still profoundly pagan, but to the East. Only a mind confused as his would have chosen Iamblichus, the Syrian Neo-Platonist, as the prophet of a religion that was to regenerate mankind, and Maximus the theurgist as the most fitting interpreter of the "divine" Syrian's revelation. For Maximus all writers on Julian have a mortal antipathy, and ascribe to his influence the young emperor's superstitious frenzy. But mystics of Julian's type are born, not made. He was politely avoided by the clearer thinkers among the Neo-Platonists, the serious students of Plato and Aristotle, and left to carry out his mission from Mithras with charlatans, or men like Priscus, the cold and repulsive pedant.

In Mithraism, the religion of the sun-god which in its time swayed hundreds of thousands, and has utterly vanished from the ken of the average man, Julian saw his chance to frame a monotheism that had become indispensable to himself and his contemporaries, and to introduce what had fascinated mankind in the rival religion, a divine mediator. Mithraism, in spite of its strategic errors, such as the exclusion of women from its rites, was a sentimental cult that seemed to the Christians a "satanic plagiarism" peculiarly dangerous to the original, and under Constantius was so persecuted that one was liable to be arrested for gazing at a sunset. The Mithraic conception of the sun as the central symbol of the universe was in harmony with Neo-Platonic doctrine derived from Plato. Julian accordingly set out to unite in Mithras, his chosen god, the functions of those gods of Greece whom a phil-Hellene must have in at all costs. As though men whom Christianity had failed to reform were to be won by a gospel of Apollo and Dionysus purified of all the warm and endearing attributes that had charmed the sensuous Greeks! For the divine simplicity of the promises of Christ, Julian substituted the mystic phantasms of oriental Neo-Platonism, the glad tidings of the transcendental One, the intelligible gods (*νοητοί*), and the intelligent (*νοεροί*), the last an innovation due to Iamblichus, who gave a new vocabulary to Neo-Platonism. By his worship of Mithras and his peculiar syncretism Julian seems to have broken away from Iamblichus. But, these heresies apart, he is only the echo of that far less confused theosophist,¹ and to grasp Julian's meaning, unless one is content with his saving clause *πιστεῦσθω μᾶλλον ἢ δεικνίσθω*, one must forever be turning to the *Protrepticus* and the *De Mathematica* of Iamblichus, to the *De Mysteriis*, which, if not authentic, at least reflects his views, and to Plotinus and Porphyry.

Mau's monograph is the first systematic attempt to trace in the emperor's two *φυσικοὶ ὕμνοι* the influence of preceding Neo-Platonists. This is following the excellent example of R. Asmus who has done so

¹ I cannot agree with Geffcken who, in *Neue Jahrbücher*, March, 1908, finds Julian's exposition "leichter und einfacher" than that of Iamblichus.

much to determine the precise character of Julian's Cynicism. The loss of Iamblichus' *Περὶ θεῶν*, which was almost certainly the source of Julian's hastily written hymn to the sun, is a serious hindrance to a precise estimate of the emperor's borrowings, and the lack of a collection of the fragments of Iamblichus was so keenly felt by Mau that he promises an edition at some future date. His method is to expound the hymns section by section, giving in copious footnotes the parallel passages from Julian's predecessors. The notes are restricted to Neo-Platonic illustrations and occasional citations of Plato and Aristotle. Sallust's tract *Περὶ θεῶν καὶ κόσμου*, called by Cumont the "official catechism of the pagan empire," and by Wilamowitz the "positive complement of Julian's work *Contra Christianos*," is frequently quoted by Mau, who points out a number of close parallels with Julian. He agrees with Zeller, Cumont, and Negri, against Wilamowitz, in identifying its author with that friend of Julian to whom his fourth oration is addressed.

In the fifth oration, the hymn to the mother of the gods, we see the effort of Julian to adapt to his philosophic scheme the other great mysteries cult of his day. The Mithraic religion, seeking to conciliate the other cults of the empire, had, from the first, associated with the sun-god the worship of the Magna Mater, and Attis had been endowed with the attributes of Mithras. Though the second hymn is nominally in honor of Cybele, Attis is the real hero. Writing of his descent to earth Julian uses the word *συγκατάβασις*, which had been employed by the Christians to describe the incarnation of Christ. Attis is Hermes, Dionysus, the moon, the sun, and finally Mithras the *νοερός θεός*. Vain is all Mau's endeavor to make clear to us what was so obviously never clear to Julian, the steps by which Attis attains his apotheosis and his precise functions. It is waste of time to try to make out for Julian a coherent or consistent creed.

In the translation of the two hymns which closes his tract Mau prints a few marginal references to indicate echoes or quotations of classical Greek literature, especially of Plato and Aristotle. But he does not attempt to be exhaustive, and hardly adds to Hertlein's collection of such references in the footnotes to his text. In fact, on Julian 143 A, where Julian cites Aristotle's *Ethics*, Mau reprint's Hertlein's error in the reference.

In this thorough discussion of the two orations, Mau ignores the fact that they are really sophistic compositions and fall under the definition of *φυσικοί ὕμνοι* given, perhaps a century earlier, by Menander in his treatise *Περὶ ἐπιδεικτικῶν*. The fourth oration has, however, nearly all the features of a *βασίλικός λόγος*. But, after all, their only interest for us lies in this, that in all the range of Neo-Platonic literature they best illustrate the methods by which philosophy sought to enlist the support of the pagan cults against Christianity, that would conciliate no cult and no philosophy.

WILMER CAVE WRIGHT